## Application No. Applicant(s) 10/019,962 PERALA ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 1712 Jeffrey B. Robertson All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Jeffrey B. Robertson. (2) Philip Dubois. Date of Interview: 06 January 2004. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference 2) applicant's representative c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant e) No. Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: n/a. Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Kuriyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,851,481) and Gasmena (U.S. Patent No. 5,703,178). Agreement with respect to the claims f) $\square$ was reached. g) $\square$ was not reached. h) $\bowtie$ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Dubois and the examiner discussed proposals to overcome the specification objections and rejections over the prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY

FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

signature, if required